



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,508	10/05/2005	Sylvain Orenga	125292	2414
25944	7590	04/07/2008	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				HOBBS, LISA JOE
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1657				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/07/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/552,508	ORENGA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lisa J. Hobbs	1657	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>23 Nov 2005</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .                         |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse in the reply filed on 31 January 2008 is acknowledged.

The arguments presented were found persuasive and the claims have been rejoined.

### ***Priority***

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in France on 07 April 2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the French patent application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 23 November 2005, is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Claim Status***

Claims 1-16 are active in the case. Claims 17-19 have been cancelled by preliminary amendment. Claims 1-16 are under examination; no claims are withdrawn as drawn to a non-elected invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (US 5,854,011) in view of Cooke et al. ((1999) Appl. Env. Microbiol. 65(2): 807-812), Kardos et al. ((2000) Toxicological Sciences 58: 118-126), Sondegaard et al. ((2001) Chem. Eng. 7(11): 2324-2331), Merrer et al. ((1997) Bioorg. Med. Chem. 5(3): 519-533) and Gilbert et al. (WO 2002/40706). Chen et al. teach a composition and method for detecting the presence or amount of yeasts and molds in a test sample is presented. The composition contains a substrate and an inhibitor for an aminopeptidase. The substrate has a signal moiety capable of providing a detectable signal when cleaved by an aminopeptidase in yeasts or molds. The aminopeptidase inhibitor serves to reduce the endogenous aminopeptidase activity in the test sample. The method

to detect yeasts or molds in a sample includes inoculating a test sample with the disclosed composition, incubating the sample and observing any detectable signal that indicates the presence of yeasts or molds (abstract). They teach a variety of organisms (Tables I and II), substrates (Table III), inhibitors (col. 16 line 34 to col. 17 line 27), etc., with which this method can be practiced using the medium as described. They disclose the importance of such a medium and method, teaching that “yeast or mold contamination in food and other commodities can result in substantial economic losses for the producer, the processor, and the consumer. Rapid and accurate determinations of yeast and/or mold contamination in a commodity (such as, food ingredients, processed foods, and beverages), are important for the production of high-quality food products in the food industry” (col. 1 lines 24-31). They also disclose the various components, detection and inhibition: “accordingly, a medium is disclosed for detecting yeasts and molds in a biological sample. In certain preferred embodiments, the medium provides effective results by employing a newly identified ubiquitous enzyme in yeasts and molds: aminopeptidase. The medium is preferably provided in combination with an inhibitor for the aminopeptidase enzyme. The inhibitor is provided at a level that reduces endogenous activity in test samples, but which does not impair the activity in yeasts or molds. In addition, buffer ingredients, carbohydrates, amino acids, trace elements, salts, and growth stimulators provided in the medium allow sufficient growth of the organism, so that the detectable signal in the sample due to hydrolysis of aminopeptidase substrates is more effectively observed” (col. 3 lines 37-50). They do not disclose the use of esterases, osidases, Salmonella or the use of esterase or osidase inhibitors.

Cooke et al. teach the use of a medium to detect *Salmonella* esterases (abstract) which provides chromogenic substrates for the detection of the *Salmonella* in a sample to be tested and report that the disclosed medium and chromogenic substrate was extremely successful in detecting the more common *Salmonella* serotypes reported to the Public Health Laboratory Service (p. 812, col. 1). They do not teach the use of inhibitors, osidases, or *Candida* detection. Kardos et al. teach the use of organophosphates to inhibit esterases and methods for determining the amounts necessary for inhibition (abstract). They do not teach a chromogenic media, osidases, or lower organisms. Sondegaard et al. and Merrer et al. teach the use of azasugars as potent osidase inhibitors of "intense current interest" (Sondergaard et al. p. 2324, col. 1). They do not teach chromogenic media or the in vivo use of the inhibitors.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the media disclosed by Chen et al., which provides a fast and reliable way to determine the presence of harmful microorganisms in a sample, while providing a concomitant inhibition of endogenous activity in the sample, with known pathogenic organisms such as *Candida* and *Salmonella*, known enzymes such as esterases and osidases, and known inhibitors such as organophosphates and azasugars. One would have a reasonable expectation of success as evidenced by Gilbert et al., who teach chromogenic and fluorogenic media, similar to Chen et al. excepting the inhibitor, for the identification of aminopeptidases, esterases, and osidases from a range of organisms which include *Salmonella* and *Candida* (p. 1).

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1657

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa J. Hobbs whose telephone number is 571-272-3373. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon P. Weber can be reached on 571-272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lisa J. Hobbs/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1657

ljh